

PEACE NEWS

The International Pacifist Weekly

No. 827

May 2, 1952

FOURPENCE

41 REFUSE TO PAY TAXES

Americans say 90% for war

SAYING that they cannot condone the training for war of young men to be killers, and cannot support such training with their money, 41 men and women from various parts of the USA declared recently that they are openly refusing to pay their 1951 income taxes. Several of them have followed this course for a number of years.

A statement signed by the tax refusals was issued by the Tax Refusal Committee of Peacemakers, a pacifist movement patterned after the non-violent resistance of Mahatma Gandhi, with headquarters in New York City.

When he issued the statement, Rev. Ernest R. Bromley, Sharonville, Ohio, Chairman of the Tax Refusal Committee, said:

"Many people think that the greatest crime in connection with the Internal Revenue Bureau is that some of its agents have been accepting graft and buying their wives mink coats. Actually the greatest crime in connection with the Internal Revenue Bureau is that practically all of what it collects goes for mass murder."

He called attention to the fact that approximately 90 per cent. of the Bureau's collection is now being devoted to war, and that whereas the budget has more than doubled in the past four years, less is now being spent on non-war activities than four years ago.

In issuing their statement, the tax refusals said: "We make this public statement because we want our fellow citizens to know that there is a way to take a personal stand against war. Please join us in refusing taxes for war, and make your action known to your friends and neighbours."

Tribunal to sit twice weekly to deal with Z-objectors

THOUSAND-BOMBER RAID ON "FRIENDS" MADE GUNNER A PACIFIST

Peace News staff reporters

THE London Tribunal is now having to meet twice a week—on Tuesday and Fridays—to cope with the large number of Z-reservists who have applied to be registered as conscientious objectors.

Anyone who is free on these days would be well rewarded by spending an hour or two in the public gallery at Fulham Town Hall from 10.30 a.m. onwards.

Many applicants put up excellent cases at the hearing on April 22.

Italians helped him

Thomas Nutter, of 138 Westborough Road, Maidenhead, said he had been a private in the REME, and was taken prisoner at Tobruk in 1942, and transferred to Italy. He escaped from prison, and while he was on the run he met a peasant family. "They were not at all the kind of people I had been led to believe," he said.

"I had a bad leg, and I was not much good, but the lady helped me. She told me that she had a brother who was a prisoner of war in American hands, and another who was a prisoner in Russian hands. She was a Catholic, and said she believed that if all men helped each other, as she was helping me, there would not be any more wars."

"So that experience led you to believe in the brotherhood of man," remarked Mr. Tudor Davies.

"Yes," he replied.

He told the tribunal that he did not belong to any religious denomination, because he could not see his way to worship in a church where the bishops approved of atomic bombs.

"QUESTION HOUR" FOR OBJECTORS

THE Peace Pledge Union have booked Conway Hall, Red Lion-square, for a "Question Hour for Conscientious Objectors," on Tuesday, May 27, at 7.30 p.m., and are issuing a special invitation to National Service and Z-reservist objectors to attend as well as the general public.

On the platform will be Fenner Brockway, MP, Chairman of the Central Board for Conscientious Objectors; Bernard Withers, Secretary of the CBCO; Stuart Morris and Sybil Morrison of the Peace Pledge Union. Question-master will be the Rev. John Adams, Rector of Bermondsey.

Archbishop bars debate on Quaker peace plea

"ARMS POLICY SOWING SEEDS OF DISTRUST"

— Quakers to British Council of Churches

THE Archbishop of Canterbury ruled out discussion on a message from the Society of Friends (Quakers) in Great Britain to the British Council of Churches meeting in Belfast last week.

In their message the Quakers declared that "all preparations for war and the wars now in progress in Korea and Malaya are contrary to the Will of God."

Dr. Fisher said that unless the Council felt otherwise he must rule out discussion on the statement on the ground that it was not on the agenda.

No lack of sympathy

The Belfast Telegraph reports the Archbishop as saying that the matter was of such far-reaching range that it could not be discussed without proper preparation for discussion.

He declared that there was no question of lack of sympathy with the message or of concern over the problem with which it dealt.

The full text of the message, presented to the Council by Mr. Robert Davis of Birmingham reads:

The great nations of the world are today pursuing a policy of rearmament which involves an enormous expenditure of resources in men and money, resources that would otherwise be available to build up and develop the life and welfare of the community on every level and to promote international friendship and peace.

Such a policy will, sooner or later, defeat its own ends and lead the nations into war. Such a war might mean the destruction of civilisation.

Moreover, the effect of this policy in sowing the seeds of distrust and enmity and of fear in the hearts of men everywhere is to increase tension and to frustrate all efforts for constructive peace-making and worldwide Christian service.

The situation is a challenge to the Churches to witness to the peaceable nature of Christ's Kingdom which seeks expression in national life but transcends national frontiers.

In 1948 the Amsterdam Conference declared that "war is contrary to the Will of God" and "incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." It seems to follow, therefore, that all preparation for war and the wars now in progress in Korea and Malaya are contrary to the Will of God.

"A wonderful opportunity"

We believe there rests upon the Churches now a great responsibility and a wonderful opportunity to proclaim this truth to the whole world and to affirm their faith in the possibility of a world without war. Christ's way for us as his disciples is the way of redemptive and creative love; the only way of hope and salvation for mankind. It is required of us humbly and faithfully to follow the way of his appointing at whatever cost.

People look to the Churches not for political wisdom but for prophetic witness and Christian action.

Our function is to be ambassadors for Christ; unto us is committed the ministry of reconciliation.

We pray that the Divine blessing and wisdom may attend all your deliberations in Belfast, and that you may be led under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to speak some prophetic word that will release the power of God and bring security, peace and good will to a war-weary and tormented world.

But Archbishop of York says —

BAN PETROL BOMBS

THE Archbishop of York has expressed grave concern over the use of napalm—jellied petrol-bombs—by the Allies in Korea.

He writes in his Diocesan letter:

"It appears to be a weapon which inflicts terrible and indiscriminate loss and suffering."

"In one recent case it was spread over an area of four square miles; it burned up almost instantaneously all life and buildings within it."

"Christians should demand the outlawing, by international agreement, of weapons so horrible and destructive to all who come within their range, whether soldier or civilian, whether man, woman or child."

JAPANESE DISCONTENT OVER U.S. PACT

DESPITE strenuous efforts by US official spokesmen, the Administrative Pact governing American military rights continues to be unpopular among the Japanese people.

One reason for this discontent, according to the Worldover Press Tokyo Correspondent, is the fact that Japanese courts will not have jurisdiction over offences committed by US garrison troops or personnel—in short, it is the old irritating question of extra-territoriality, a hated device of Western imperialism.

All political parties save that of Premier Yoshida argue that the Pact should have been submitted to the Diet for ratification.

HAS THE ARMS PLAN BROUGHT PEACE?

Labour MPs' dilemma

By EMRYS HUGHES, MP

IT is interesting to note how the Daily Herald is striving desperately to keep the Labour Party rank and file support for the rearmament programme.

Every Labour MP and propagandist now knows that at public meetings he has to answer searching questions about the huge sum now being spent on arms and what the Labour Party is going to do about it.

These questions are coming not merely from pacifists, but from ordinary Labour Party followers who are anxious to know whether the Party is still going to support rearmament under a Tory Government when it is obvious that one cannot have rearmament and spend the money on the social services, old age pensions, and education, and all the other things the Labour Party wants, at the same time.

To say that the Labour Party rank and file is lukewarm and apathetic to rearmament nowadays is putting it mildly.

If Labour were in power

Many speakers take the line of least resistance and discreetly avoid the subject altogether, taking the more popular line of just denouncing the Tory Government, although they must know that if Labour had won the last election and had had to find the money, men and materials for rearmament they would now be defending and apologising for economy cuts imposed by a Labour government.

Some MPs, however, still make a point of defending rearmament in their weekend speeches. And they are very much on the defensive.

There is Mr. Woodrow Wyatt, for example, who was Under-Secretary for War, during the last few months of the Labour government. Not only is Woodrow Wyatt about the last boy on the burning deck of the sinking ship of rearmament, but even when it goes down, it looks as if he will still be floundering around in the water and expecting it to come up.

Woodrow Wyatt's strange idea

Last Monday the Daily Herald reported the latest Woodrow Wyatt speech under the headline: "Our Arms Plan is Stride to Peace."

Underneath we were told "Labour's defence policy was the biggest single contribution to world peace since 1945."

Even if one assumes that there is less danger of war now than there was a year ago, a point on which both Churchill and Stalin seem to agree, there is precious little reason for believing that this is because the Russians have been intimidated by anything that Britain had been able to do in the way of rearmament.

The Russians may be afraid of the enormous destruction that might be inflicted on Russia by the American Air Force and its atom bombs, but anything that Britain has contributed to the Western armies contemplated by General Eisenhower is so small as to be almost negligible against the Russian's 220 divisions which Woodrow Wyatt used to tell us were ready to attack the West.

Russia's case

Has there ever been any real evidence that the Russians contemplate an unprovoked large scale invasion of Western Europe?

Their case is that they have had to keep large armies in Eastern Europe not because they intended to attack the West but because they feared attack from the West.

A more conciliatory policy from the West and some firm assurance that the West was not engaged in building up Germany again in readiness for war with Russia would have been a more effective step to convince Russia that there was no possibility of attack and that she could reduce her armed forces.

It may be quite true that the increased price of re-armament is placing just as great a strain, or even more so, on Russia's national economy as rearmament is placing on ours and that of France and the rest of Western Europe.

(Continued on page eight)

(Continued on page eight)

PEACE NEWS

3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4
STAmford Hill 2262 (three lines)

2nd May 1952

THE AGM

THERE were no dramatic clashes of views at the Peace Pledge Union's Annual General Meeting, and if the times were no so grim as to make it an incongruity to speak of happiness in connection with the things of peace, as one can say, "Happy is the country that has no history," so one could say, "Happy is the Conference that has no clashes."

The AGM reflected the essential unity of the Movement.

There were some challenges to the views taken by the National Council during the year, but a very decisive vote in each case made it clear that the Council had truly reflected the view of the members as a whole.

The issue of most immediate importance upon which a difference of view was declared was the relationship of pacifists to the British Peace Committee, the World Peace Council, and similar bodies.

This question had in fact been settled at previous conferences, and this one showed no disposition to register a change of view.



The high points of interest were provided at the discussion sessions on Sunday.

In the morning John Kay discussed what should be the approach of pacifists to the youthful mind, and in an address packed full of wisdom, information gained from experience, kindly tolerance, and a humour that flowed naturally from his subject, he provided a great deal of valuable guidance for parents and teachers.

His hints on the need for a sceptical and critical attitude to what appears in print were particularly useful and could very well be adopted when dealing with the fully adult as well as with the young. This particularly is a matter that might well be given consideration by the PPU Education Commission.



This discussion was followed by an address by R. H. Ward which aimed at putting the whole pacifist movement and every single pacifist in it "on the grill." This address provided much illumination but was not directed to the reaching of any positive conclusion.

The conclusion of the address, and its *raison d'être*, lay in the discussion that followed. Brief as this had to be it was an admirable reaction to the calculated provocation of the address, and underlined the service the lecturer had performed for the Conference. It showed that the Conference as a whole felt that although the pacifist had no reason to hold that his view separated him in a moral sense from those who were ready to accept war, he nevertheless had something vital that he should hold on to.

The brevity of this session, with its inevitable severe limitation on the length of speeches did not provide any examination in a fundamental sense of the view that R. H. Ward had very skilfully advanced, and its full implications. What it did was to provide a useful test, in the reaction to the challenge to any self-complacency that pacifists might be inclined to harbour; the Conference, we feel, emerged from that test pretty well.



The PPU then has taken stock; it is confirmed in its belief that it is seeking to say something that it is important should be said; it realises that it has to learn to say it more effectively, and that to say it more effectively it has to be it, too.

Let us now work hard in the world and on ourselves so that when the Movement comes together for its 1953 AGM we shall feel that we are able to show some progress towards our goal.

Adenauer's Second thoughts

AT last Dr. Adenauer has publicly recognised the full implications of giving way to British, American and French pressure.

Peace News has already pointed out that references to Western Germany, as though it were the whole of Germany, and attempts to settle in advance the policy of a reunited Germany have been among the confusions deliberately created by Western policy. Dr. Adenauer has now lost control of the Upper House of the West German Government.

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Bundestag has recommended that the Federal Government should take steps to encourage trade with the Eastern bloc, including Russia.

In the Ruhr 2,000 foundry workers have called for an immediate stoppage of work throughout Western Germany if Adenauer signs the Contractual Agreement.

These may be some of the reasons which have compelled him to think again.

He has now broadcast that he is in favour of negotiations between the Western Powers and Russia on the recent proposals for German unity and has recognised that when Germany is united the present Governments of Western and Eastern Germany will disappear and that a united Germany would be a new State different from either of its divisions, and would have to be free to make a new political start unprejudiced by any previous decisions of its component parts.

The Federal German Government can no more bind an all-German Government to participate in the European Defence Community than the East German Government can bind a united Germany to associate with the Cominform.

The future German Government must be completely free to do either or neither.

Western pressure

Yet it is of the essence of French policy that Western Germany should be so tied to EDC that she would never be able to leave it and set up a national army of her own.

France is still hoping that Britain and America will guarantee to exert substantial pressure on any member State which tried to leave EDC. If that has meaning it is that Germany must remain divided because once Germany is united Western Germany will cease to exist as a separate unit.

Moreover, for the Western Powers to attempt to commit a part of Germany irreversibly to their side, even after reunion, is to render such reunion virtually impossible. Yet Britain and America are putting increasing pressure on Western Germany to conclude the Contractual Agreement within the next two or three weeks.

Acheson may claim that the new Note to Russia will not shut any doors, but the danger is that the reply will be delayed until the door is shut and Russia presented with a *fait accompli*.

It is hypocrisy to talk about a desire for German unity under such circumstances. It is as though a father should say to his daughter: "Of course, I want to see you and your fiancé married, but I must insist on your going into a convent first."

Britain and America, for the sake of satisfying the concern of France about a possible threat from a reunited and rearmed Germany, must not take the final step of making the reunion of Germany by agreement with Russia impossible, by seeking in advance to bind Western Germany into EDC, or by giving to France a fantastic guarantee.

The best guarantee which France could have would be that of a united Germany permanently disarmed, and of agreement in the Disarmament Commission which would lead to treaties under which all other Governments would follow the example of German disarmament, which they failed to do after the Treaty of Versailles.

Korea

AS we go to press there is no news of the outcome of the discussions at the plenary session of the Korean armistice negotiations.

New minimum conditions were to be tabled acceptable to the United States Government and the other Governments associated with them in the Korean war.

It is reported of these proposals that while care will be taken not to create the effect of an ultimatum it is sought by them to discover whether the North Koreans and Chinese are genuinely seeking to bring the talks to a conclusion.

These talks have drifted on so long and have had such an inconsequential quality that it has been impossible for the observer to gather what has really been happening. One of the factors that has made the completion of the discussions difficult has been the American Government's disinclination to come to a point when it will be compelled to discuss the whole power lay-out in the Far East, including the standing of Mao-Tse-tung's Government and the question of Formosa. This reluctance has probably led to an indisposition on both sides to bring the talks to their term.

Certainly one has gained the impression of a kind of see-saw process in the negotiations with points that one had assumed to be settled at one of the sessions cropping up as obstinate points for disagreement later on.

BEHIND THE NEWS

The plenary session in question was originally arranged for Sunday last, but at the last moment the United States representatives asked for its postponement. The meeting was subsequently fixed for Monday.

It seems probable that the Americans had found reason to ask for further instructions on the question of prisoner exchanges. This has been one of the most important barriers to the termination of the talks, and here the trouble would seem to have sprung from what can only be described as a piece of stupidity on the part of the military command.

Military stupidity

The Korean war is at basis a civil war. Consequently many prisoners on both sides are very ready to transfer their allegiance after their capture. The Northern authorities demand the return of all prisoners in the lists supplied by General Ridgway's headquarters.

The US authorities naturally take the view that it would be an act of disloyalty to send back those who have declared themselves against the Northern Forces; which raises the obvious question of why were they still being treated as prisoners and why were their names included in the lists supplied to the Northern army authorities.

The protracted talks are now held to be disadvantageous to the USA because of the formidable military build-up that is in progress in the North, and that will be further developed while the talks continue; and also because the lack of a settlement is an undesirable factor as the Presidential election approaches.

It is to be hoped that in an effort to get definitive results the Americans will not slip into position where they will feel that they have to treat their proposals as an ultimatum. It would be an act of mercy to the Korean people to bring an end to the strain of the uncertainty that remains over their land; but it would be a monstrous piece of inhumanity to put them again under the harrow of war.

UN Disarmament Commission

SO much depends upon the outcome of the discussions in the Disarmament Commission that we must not lose sight of what is happening there.

We regret that the Soviet delegate introduced the question of germ warfare in Korea at the first meeting of the Commission, that the chairman permitted a discussion on a matter outside the terms of reference, and that the British delegate allowed himself to be inveigled into the discussion rather than insisting that the matter, however important, was the concern of the Security Council and not of the Commission. The business of the Commission is difficult enough without the introduction of such additional matters of controversy.

The US delegate has now tabled six points as a basis for the Commission's work. These state that the goal of disarmament is not to regulate but to prevent war by relaxing the fear caused by armaments and by making war inherently impossible: that to achieve this end all States must co-operate to establish an open and substantially disarmed world, agreeing to reduce their armed forces to the minimum necessary to maintain internal security and fulfil their obligations under the Charter.

Such agreements would have to ensure the progressive reduction of armaments to the level at which no State would be able to start a war, provide for a census of all armaments, and the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. It would also be necessary to establish a system of international inspection and control, particularly of atomic energy.

Since these points cover all the points made by the previous Soviet proposals, a step forward has been taken by the Americans in substituting these basic requirements for their previous proposals. If agreement can thus be reached on basic requirements, questions as to the priority of the chronology of the steps to be taken must not be allowed to bring the work of the Commission to nought and to mock the hopes of peoples everywhere.

Ultimatum

THE important aspect of Truman's recent disclosure that he had sent an ultimatum to Stalin in 1946 in regard to Russian troops in Persia, does not turn on whether his account or that of the State Department is correct.

It is that Truman claims that in the exercise of the emergency powers vested in him the President of the USA could issue such an ultimatum if he thought fit.

The British Government should immediately seek safeguards which would at least

make it impossible for the British people to be involved in war with Russia automatically by the irresponsible action of any President of the United States.

One of the traffic signs on the road leading past American Headquarters in Berlin says "Go slow—death is so final." True; it is the personal ultimatum, and no one man should be entrusted with the power to take a decision which might involve the death of millions of people.

The traffic sign for statesmen must be "Go slow" or "Halt—major war ahead."

A tribunal is ironical

THE national religion of this country is based on the New Testament.

One would think that this fact might influence the minds of the members of a tribunal set up by Parliament to examine young men who claim to have a conscientious objection to participation in war.

It is therefore somewhat surprising that an application has been dismissed because the standards the young objector uses in grappling with the problems of the day are too close to the teachings that are to be found in the New Testament.

Last week the London Tribunal dismissed an applicant—who they claimed had not thought out his case sufficiently—with the words:

"He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long view it would be better to allow themselves to be slain."

The Tribunal were evidently expressing their feeling that there had been an affront to their practical sense, but is it too much to suggest that before their next sitting they should re-read the story of the crucifixion?

Asia and UN

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU speaking at New Delhi in commemoration of the events at Jalianwalla Bagh (scene of the Amritsar massacre in 1919 when 400 unarmed Indians were shot down by British troops) commented on the weakening of the influence of the United Nations Organisation resulting from such decisions as that taken in the Tunisian dispute.

It was possible that there was more than one opinion on the matter, he said, "but I do not understand why it cannot be discussed."

He pointed out that India and several other nations of Asia and Africa wanted the matter dealt with. He was surprised at the way in which the voice of Africa and Asia was ignored.

It must be remembered that the peoples of Africa and Asia constitute more than half the world's population. Every time a decision is reached on such issues as this on the basis of calculations as to the reciprocal support that may be needed on other disputed matters the capacity of UNO to act on a basis of principle becomes lessened.

The principles of the Declaration of Human Rights stand little chance against the requirements of "defence" programmes.

The reason that the American Government refused to help those who wished the Tunisian question to be discussed in the UN was that it was anxious not to alienate French opinion before the question of a European army is settled. Great Britain is influenced by the same considerations that move the USA with the addition of its own dubious position in Central and South-West Africa.

Collective Punishment

GENERAL TEMPLER has extended the policy he first adopted at Tanjong Malim of making collective punishments.

Sungei Pelek, in Southern Selangor, has since been put under similar penalties.

What makes one's gorge rise against these collective punishments (which unpleasant as they are, are mild compared with the treatment meted out by the Germans in similar circumstances or with the ills inflicted under "United Nations" control in Korea) is the moral self-righteousness that accompanies them.

"It does not amuse me to punish innocent people," said General Templer, when he started on this course, "but many of you are not innocent."

"Innocence" in this sense means siding with and being willing to help the forces under General Templer's command, and not being willing to help the forces opposed to him.

Those who are fighting against his forces are not an enemy but are "terrorists"; it thus becomes an act of guilt or cowardice to be on their side.

Those who are afraid to be against the "terrorists" are to be made afraid also not to be against them.

This kind of thing unfortunately grows in ruthlessness as it is pursued, and we hope that the moral discomfort that has already been disclosed in Parliament, and the apologetic justification that has been advanced will mean that it is going to be stopped.

Even if the troops against whom General Templer is engaged must be called terrorists we do not want to have to call him one too.

The
as it
I. TO
To Mr. Tax
(Inland Rev
"The Leech
Two Party (Between the
Dear Sir,

My unfi
of the first
expenses, in
from Bedford
Rule 3 (a) &
"D." Even
to me why
hope to inhe
difference it
in a chariot
spared the e
that I must
the last two
parations ne
by saying th
Why, sir,
wars and t
Christian's s
of Doubting
Avoidance,
Legality's H
and the way
to venture f
While I lo
I saw a mai
sweet and w
"Friend,
But I am a
to relieve a
stand and lo
"Sir," I
goods. It c
in my cell
to glory."

"Ah! Y
You made a
"The bo
but little to
IT would
political
and clearly
this book.
were in for

This book
serious limit
plan for the
but confron
America's g
natural res
something i
be up again
the ear of
solved legac
problem, an
completely f
fesses that
trends "is
balance bet
rest, as to
panic as to
armament (

Bevan's R
Russia is o
cated in thi
of going
of Mutual
the new po
it to the w
money was
ments prod
of the p
countries.

That ac
Britain's m
possibly t
America's l
nomic and
would fol
Bevan wou

Presuma
in the Bev
time he sh

America?
Having
of Russia,
fear of A
the world'
materials,
dollars are
exhausting
according
importing
from outsi
their indust

Bevan is
problem, a
were the i
umption
would pre
lem of Bi
countries.
Moreover,
countries
their indu

New so
also subst

The Correspondence of Mr. John Bunyan, Pilgrim as it appeared in a Dream to Mr. Tax-Gatherer Implacable

By Dennis Gray Stoll

I. TO BE A PILGRIM

To Mr. Tax-Gatherer Implacable
(Inland Revenue and Vain Confidence Section),
"The Leeches,"
Two Party Cove,
Between the Elections.

Dear Sir,

Re Tax—John Bunyan

My unfortunate duty is to thank you for your letter of the first. I do not understand your ruling that my expenses, in so far as they relate to travelling to and from Bedford Jail, are not admissible deductions under Rule 3 (a) and Rule 3 (b) of Cases 1 and 2 of Schedule "D." Even the great mercy of God has failed to reveal to me why I am liable to a capital levy on the joys I hope to inherit in the Celestial City, and a sur-tax on the difference it made to me when I saw Faithful raised high in a chariot above the snares of Vanity Fair and forever spared the evils of the City of Destruction. You claim that I must bear my share of the debt incurred during the last two wars with Apollyon, and pay for the preparations now in hand for the next. And you conclude by saying that you will be glad to have my observations.

Why, sir, then I must tell you that this burden of wars and taxes upon my back is more terrible than Christian's struggle with Giant Despair in the dungeons of Doubting Castle. My local MP, Sir Ernest Clever-Avoidance, advised me to seek deliverance at Mr. Legality's House. But the fees on the gate were so high, and the way up the hill to the house so steep, that I feared to venture further lest the house should fall on my head.

While I stood bewailing this unhappy state of affairs, I saw a man of worldly countenance approaching me with sweet and winning deportment.

"Friend," said he, "men falsely call me By-Ends. But I am a knowing man, always eager to do anything to relieve a neighbour. I have come to ask why you stand and look up the hill with so glum a face?"

"Sir," I replied, "I am a pilgrim, poor in worldly goods. It chanced that I fell into an allegory as I lay in my cell at Bedford Jail, and wrote about a journey to glory."

§

"Ah! You are the author of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. You made a handsome profit out of it, I believe?"

"The book sold with much benefit to my publisher, but little to me. Since I wrote it I have worked harder

than before, trying to instruct the miserable people of this country in the way they might reach the Celestial City. I have been frequently importuned by Mr. Tax-Gatherer Implacable, and several times remanded in to prison because duties required of me under the National Service Acts came in to conflict with the service I owe to the Prince of Peace. I seek relief from my heavy burden of resistance to war and taxes at Mr. Legality's House, but his fees are too high."

"Faugh!" cried By-Ends, with a great roar of humour. "And so you should be cast in to jail. It's against all nature to resist war. Surely you've heard Archbishop Two-Tongues' sermon on 'Resist Not Evil'? As for your idea of working harder than ever, I say that those who are fools enough to do it ought to be taxed out of existence. I am myself a pilgrim on my way to the same City you mention, but I'm taking care to collect on the way a few easily-come-by armaments contracts. Of course I have a permit to travel in comfort, and plenty of papers to prove that I'm doing essential work. You must surely be aware of the part I have played in assisting Our Lady Mistress of Food?"

"Is not that Lady she who has caused so many hungry bodies to live in violent distemper? Doth she not speak smoothly, and say with bewitching smiles: 'Since the dear people have so little meat, I will make sure that they have plenty of puff and bubbles to eat instead'?"

§

"Ha, ha! You hit it. You're not so simple as you look. See, my good fellow, you must come and dine at the banquet in Madame Puff and Bubble's honour which my two firms, Bulk Buying Unlimited and the Gambia Tinned Grub Company, are holding at the Castle Abounding. Tickets are obtainable from the Hon. Sec., Mr. Inflation, at five almost worthless paper guineas each. But you can pay me personally in gold now if you like."

By-Ends fingered the leather purse at his side, which made me haste to tell him: "Already I have been bounden to borrow from Mr. Little Faith, the Usurer, to pay Mr. Implacable his Final Demand note."

"Tut, tut!" replied By-Ends. "Then you are a worse fool than I took you for. Having had the cunning to earn a sum, you should have the sense not to lose a penny of it. Only yesterday My Hard Labour Lord Turnover was saying to me: 'There are some simpletons who hazard all for God at a clap. But you and I know,

Friend By-Ends, that it's best to keep in well with the Church and say one does it, while building up a nice little nest egg of farms and armaments factories abroad in the Empire Beautiful.' I must say I consider Lord Turnover to be even wiser than the serpent in the holy scriptures. When the crash of reckoning comes and the war begins, we can go where there is fair weather. In the meantime we can encourage Chancellor Fair-Speech to give other people's money away, and take the benefit and applause to ourselves."

"I wonder, sir, that you should not consider this double-dealing. Did you say that you had never given occasion to men to call you By-Ends?"

"Never, never! Men are jealous because I have always had the luck to jump in my judgment with the times. I keep company with those worthies, Mr. Justice Facing-Both-Ways and Archbishop Two-Tongues. You have heard of them, have you not?"

"Doubt not that I have heard of you all! You are the men who sold the bricks and supplied the mortar for the City of Destruction, and it was in your stables that they fed the Apollyon which Christian fought in the Valley of Humiliation. I have heard of you all by one name, and that is 'Unprincipled.'"

§

By-Ends blew out his cheeks, and was much offended.

"I have my principles," he said, "and I shall not desert them while they are harmless and profitable to me. If you will not take the same road, I shall soon find someone else who will be glad of my company. Ah! I see Mr. Worldly-Wiseman and Mr. Vain-Hope coming. They will be very ready to listen to me."

He strode away to meet these two men. And I was left alone with my great burden.

This, Mr. Tax-Gatherer Implacable, concludes my observations to date, which I hope you will be as glad of as you said you would. I remain carrying my burden with God's help, steadfast in my first avowed intent to be a pilgrim. If in the course of the next few years I publish another book, I will write to you giving an account of the royalties I must needs now be silent about. Meanwhile, I bid you adieu.

Yours in the faith,

JOHN BUNYAN.

PS. It would be advisable to address future communications to me "The Jail, Bedford," for at least six months. J.B.

WILFRED WELLOCK reviews ANEURIN BEVAN'S IN PLACE OF PEACE *

IT would be excellent if every rising politician expressed his views as openly and clearly as Aneurin Bevan has done in this book. We should then know what we were in for if ever he got power.

This book needs thinking about, for it has serious limitations. It produces a practical plan for the removal of the fear of Russia, but confronts us with facts concerning America's growing demands on the earth's natural resources which show that unless something is done about it the world may be up against an even greater problem than the fear of Russia. That is one of the unsolved legacies of this book; it reveals a problem, and a fear, which the author has completely failed to fathom. Indeed he confesses that the consequence of present trends "is to create such a state of ill-balance between the dollar world and the rest, as to give rise to alarm bordering on panic as to what will happen when the re-armament drive is over . . .".

Bevan's policy of overcoming the fear of Russia is one which many of us have advocated in this journal and in pamphlets, that of going all out on the World Plan of Mutual Aid. He would fix a date when the new policy was to begin, then announce it to the world, stating precisely how much money was to be transferred from armaments production to bettering the conditions of the people in the under-developed countries.

That act would be the assertion of Britain's moral leadership of the world, and possibly the point of breakaway from America's leadership based on financial, economic and military power. We pacifists would follow it up with disarmament, but Bevan would not.

Presumably this will be the main plank in the Bevan foreign policy. In the meantime he should offer us precise figures!

America's demands

Having resolved the problem of the fear of Russia, however, Bevan is haunted by fear of America's rapacious demands for the world's limited supplies of vital raw materials, which her abundant, high-priced dollars are able to buy. So rapidly is she exhausting her once rich resources that, according to Governor Dewey, she is now importing "more than 90 raw materials from outside her borders, all essential for her industries."

Bevan is at a loss what to do about this problem, and states with lamentation that were the USA to reduce her newsprint consumption by a very small percentage it would pretty well solve the newsprint problem of Britain and the West European countries. But that is only one item. Moreover, what is to happen as the countries of the awakening East step up their industrial production?

New sources of supply may be discovered, also substitutes for many raw materials,

but the latter is a long-term job, while the problem is immediate, and is growing.

Bevan's solution is State planning everywhere and world control of natural resources. But that involves a degree of Socialism far beyond present hopes. Meanwhile the USA is in the happy position of being able to provide her people with both guns and butter, whereas all other countries have to limit their guns and ration their butter. Bevan has to admit what I have been saying for some years, that the world cannot live at the American level.

The root evil

It is, therefore, clear and conclusive, although Bevan fails to realise it, that the root evil is an uncontrolled materialism, a civilisation of multiplying appetites wholly unrelated to the good life. At the materialistic level, control will be next to impossible, and will demand more and more repression until it borders on dictatorship. Bevan's solution of rigorous State control through priorities, rationing and restrictions of all kinds, and of world control of natural resources, calls for more discipline than Socialism can command. At times he leads us to fear American capitalism, yet he has to admit that American capitalism has produced the goods, both guns and butter; and to enforce austerity amidst plenty is a much harder job than where the cupboards are empty.

Pacifist Miscellany PETERLOO

"PETERLOO" is remembered as a winning battle of unarmed people against armed violence.

On Aug. 16, 1819, 80,000 men, women and children assembled on St. Peter's Fields, Manchester, to support political reform.

To emphasise their peaceful intentions, the promoters allowed even walking sticks only to the old and infirm. Nevertheless panic-stricken magistrates let loose yeomanry and hussars. Hundreds were struck down; 11 died. But the revulsion of the nation on hearing the news turned the martyrdom into a victory.

Incidentally, the event moved Shelley to write his eloquent yet soberly-conceived "Masque of Anarchy," with its plain and simple call for a socialist pacifism.

Now the Manchester Corporation very properly is including an artist's picture of the scene in its reconstructed Free Trade Hall, the victorious suffering having been endured on the site.

A good, brief account of the whole event is given in Dr. Pauline Greg's "Social and Economic History of Britain, 1760-1950," published by Harrop, 1950.

P.R.

Everywhere the people are tiring of putting guns before butter.

But the problem would still be there, and would grow daily, if gun production stopped altogether.

Bevan completely overlooks the fact that the materialism of capitalism has descended upon socialism, and that the American "way of life" is generally accepted in the West, including Britain. He himself finds it good, and he would like to extend it, for he supports the money-values of our time, which he calls amenities, and says they are what people want to-day. They are modern civilisation. But unfortunately they cannot be had, and even if there were no rearmament they could not be had for long. Hence there is nothing for it but rigid control. A whole array of new tensions will arise, including Communist agitation, which will call for bigger armaments than ever.

There is another solution which Bevan, with his instinctive Welsh appreciation of spiritual values, ought to see, but unfortunately he doesn't. On several occasions he deplores the depersonalisation of the common man in modern repetitive industry, but he never faces up to its implications. He assumes that merely by awakening in the mind of the repetitive worker a consciousness that he is working for the common good, he will be restored to wholeness, which is sheer nonsense and wishful thinking.

There is only one way out of the problem which Bevan praises and now fears, and that is the adoption of the objective of a qualitative civilisation which uses the creative powers of all workers. The pursuit of qualitative or creative ends would cause spiritual values to supersede money values, and simplify life in a hundred ways, and so reduce the call on material resources. It is the sacrifice of lower for higher values.

Bevan will find the solution to his problem if he works out the implications of a fine passage near the end of his book. Here it is:

"It is, therefore, no accident that it is among the solid artisan classes that you will find the most tolerance and the least belligerency. Their attitude corresponds most closely with that of democratic socialism. Their lives are rounded by the rhythm of daily labour which lead to a wholesome psychology needing no compensation in flag-waving and drum-beating. They have little taste for the greatest adventure of all—war."

In short, Bevan expects to gather grapes from thistles. His book reveals fatal contradictions in his policy which would result in the bondage of strictly controlled national economies operating under a super-controlled, world economy which the USA would dominate. He must think again.

* Heineman, 6s. (paper cover)
(Other book reviews on page six.)

We did not say it . . .

Surely it is the lowest depth of inanity for the BBC to copy the Americans in televising an atom bomb explosion to millions of firesides. As entertainment, this is a strange taste. As education, it has no more worth than a firework display. As a contribution to world hysteria it would be hard to equal it.

Will the BBC governors assemble their children to look? What the Americans do is their own affair, but we say this ought to be stopped—*Daily Mirror*, April 24, 1952.

*

We wives and mothers want to see our children grow up well and happy, we want to see them study in large, sunny classrooms. But the war budgets swallow up the money that should be expended on children's health and schools. War budgets are a Moloch feeding on small children.—*Vera Inber*, Soviet writer and poet, *News*, April 15, 1952.

THE AGM

I WRITE on the eve of the Peace Pledge Union's Fifteenth Annual General Meeting.

We are looking forward to having a good gathering and to going away to increased activities, re-inspired and more encouraged than ever.

We shall be reporting about a year in which there has been much to encourage us all in terms of both renewed activity and increased financial contributions. In my report I suggest that it is important that these should indicate the measure of how much more we can yet do together, rather than of what we have already achieved.

That there is increasing need of our work and witness none can doubt. That our work and witness depend for their effectiveness on every member of the PPU and every reader of Peace News is no less certain.

We always have a collection at each session of the AGM towards our future work, but as many of you who read this will, unfortunately, not have been able to attend the meeting, may I ask you to do your share by sending a special AGM gift to Headquarters Fund? We shall be very grateful for anything and everything you can spare, and as this is a special occasion of importance to every member of the PPU and to many PN readers I know that I shall not appeal in vain for a record total this week.

STUART MORRIS,
General Secretary.

Our aim for the year (which we passed in 1951): £1,000.

Amount received to date (i.e., one-third of the year): £112.

So we still have a long way to go, and we really do need every penny of the £1,000.

Donations to the Peace Pledge Union should be sent marked "Headquarters Fund," to the PPU Treasurer at Dick Sheppard House, Endsleigh Street, W.C.1.

THE PEACE PLEDGE UNION'S ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Unanimous support for "Human Rights" Bill

A N EMERGENCY RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS BILL WHICH FENNER BROCKWAY, MP, HOPES TO PRESENT TO PARLIAMENT THIS MONTH, WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE PEACE PLEDGE UNION'S ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING IN LONDON LAST WEEKEND.

The meeting was told that the Second Reading of the Bill should have taken place on Friday, April 25, but business in the House was delayed because insufficient members were present when Private Member's Bills were being taken.

The resolution, moved by Hugh Brock and seconded by Trefor Davies, read:

"This Annual General Meeting of the Peace Pledge Union deplores the fact that the second reading of the Human Rights Bill ('A Bill to Secure Full and Equal Human Rights for All Peoples in the UK, British Colonies and Protectorates, Irrespective of Race, Colour, Religion or Sex') did not take place in Parliament on April 25 and urges every member of the Union to impress on their MP the need to support the Bill by their presence when it next comes before the House."

Sybil Morrison re-elected Chairman

The Fifteenth Annual General Meeting was opened by the Chairman, Sybil Morrison, who read messages of support and sympathy from a number of sponsors and prominent members unable to be present. In addition to the messages printed elsewhere were those from Canon C. E. Raven, Vera Brittain, Emrys Hughes, MP, and Michael Tippett.

A cable had been received from A. J. Muste, Secretary of the American Fellowship of Reconciliation, saying how encouraged were pacifists in the USA by their sense of unity with the whole pacifist movement.

Fraternal delegates attended from the National Peace Council, the Friends Peace Committee, the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Labour Pacifist Fellowship.

Stuart Morris, as National Returning Officer, announced the results of the election of officers and loud and long applause greeted the announcement that Sybil Morrison had been re-elected for a second term of office as National Chairman.

A motion from PPU National Council that Bernard Boothroyd, Associate Editor of Peace News, and former Editor, be made a Sponsor of the PPU was carried with acclamation.

The meeting then got down to a four-hours-long agenda dealing with the business of the Union.

General Secretary's Report

The first of many reports to come up for scrutiny was that of the General Secretary.

Llew Lloyd (Liverpool), disliked the phrase in the policy section of the report: "... the PPU could not, and should not, expect to be a mass movement ..." and moved the reference back of that section in order that the phrase might be re-worded.

It was agreed that there was an over-emphasis and the reference back was carried after further discussion.

The affiliation of the PPU with the National Peace Council, the No-Conscription Council, the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism and the War Resisters' International was approved with the passage of Section IV of the Report.

Dr. Jameson, PPU representative on the Congress Committee, emphasised the value of the work being undertaken by Fenner Brockway, MP, and others in the struggle against Imperialism. In reply to a question concerning the Kenya Land Petition with the circulation of which the PPU is assisting, it was stated that signatures were still coming in and the result was not yet known.

Pacifists and Partisans

Peter Marsh (Ipswich) said that he felt the first half of Section V of the General Secretary's Report, "The PPU and Others"

was a statement likely to be misunderstood by the man in the street. This reads:

"That pacifists should be called Communists does not make them so, nor should pacifists abstain from any activity because of what they may be called. Nevertheless, such misunderstandings make it increasingly necessary for the PPU to make its position and its particular contribution towards effective peacemaking as clear as possible."

"It is obvious that others who use the word peace do not mean by it all that pacifists do. In the case of the British Peace Committee, further talks and an unofficial conference, at which their representatives met representatives of the PPU and several other peace organisations, failed to get down to a serious discussion on the fundamental meaning of peace, and made it clear that the difference in motive, aim and methods between the BPC and other peace organisations is fundamental, and that there is no basis of unity.

"National Council believes that the PPU can best serve the peace which it seeks to achieve by making as clear as possible the particular and unique contribution which pacifists can make. To blur this for the sake of a superficial uniformity, when there can be no real unity, does a disservice to the cause, whatever immediate advantage some might see in it."

Why did we stand aloof, Peter Marsh asked. Members of the British Peace Committee were as sincere in their desire for peace as we were and we should thank God that men like Gordon Schaffer and Ivor Montagu were in the peace movement.

He himself attended meetings of the British Peace Committee and had heard nothing to which exception could be taken. The movement was losing a great opportunity, he felt, by refusing to co-operate with those who went 95 per cent. of the way with us and genuinely desired peace.

The reference back was seconded by Ursula Massey (Newcastle).

Minnie Pallister (Hastings), said that there was a fundamental difference in the policy of the two organisations. The World Peace Council, of which the British Peace Committee was the British section, was prepared to use force.

There was not one in a thousand people who did not sincerely desire peace. We were told that the Army, Navy, and the Air Force were maintained for peace; war itself was fought to ensure peace.

The Peace Pledge Union had renounced both international and civil war and because of this fundamental difference it was impossible to share a common platform with those organisations prepared to use force in the struggle for peace. (Loud applause.)

Door left open

Stuart Morris said that this problem, which had arisen during recent years, had frequently been before the National Council who had tried repeatedly to find some basis for co-operation. They had reluctantly come to the conclusion that there was none and that to try to reach some superficial agreement for working together would be damaging to the cause they all had at heart.

Nevertheless the door was left open. If the PPU received any invitation from the World Peace Council it would be considered on its merits.

The true affiliation of the PPU, however, was with the War Resisters International and not the World Peace Council. (Loud applause.) In some countries where the World Peace Council was powerful, and officially recognised, the freedom of members of the War Resisters International was greatly restricted, even to the extent of their lives being endangered. How then could the PPU be affiliated to the WPC?

Stuart Morris then quoted statements by officials and supporters of the World Peace Council, declaring that the Cominform Peace front was not "a renunciation of force," or an "unmanly refusal of war" and that "the task of building up an army was not contrary to the fight for peace."

We should remain good friends with the British Peace Committee, but go our different ways.

Leonard Bird (Hull) agreed with Stuart Morris that we should continue to stand for pacifism but saw no reason why this should prevent our speaking from the

platforms of the British Peace Committee if invited to do so. He would oppose this section of the report if it meant that we should refuse ever to work with the British Peace Committee or the WPC. He was assured that this was not so.

F. A. Bristow (Hastings) said that the common denominator for members of the PPU lay in their pledge, to renounce war and never support or sanction another, and outside that pledge members should feel free to act as seemed best in their individual circumstances.

The reference back was defeated by 244 votes to 58.

Hugh Brock (London), though voting against the reference back, said that he hoped nevertheless that if the PPU were invited to send an observer to speak at meetings of the World Peace Council, the National Council would give it consideration. He felt that the visit of the Rev. Clifford MacQuire, General Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, to the WPC meeting in Vienna had been most valuable.

Sydney Billson (London) asked whether there had been any follow-up to the letter written by Dr. Alex Comfort to News, and was told that the possibility of a letter to the World Peace Council was being considered.

Libel actions

Gladys Gellett (Willesden), said that she hoped that the PPU would not again resort to law for the settlement of their differences, as in the case of the dispute with Earl Bathurst. Pacifism means faith in the law of love, and in turning the other cheek. A pacifist cannot go to law. She moved a reference back, which was seconded by Rowland Philcox (Willesden), who felt that to believe in pacifism and law at the same time was a contradiction in terms.

Kathleen Rawlins (Watford), while not wishing to prevent the National Council from ever going to law, nevertheless expressed her uneasiness at the action taken in regard to Earl Bathurst.

Phyllis Vallance (Chelsea), pointed out that we were asking the nations of the world to appeal to law instead of force. Why then should not pacifists individually appeal to the law?

David Roberts (Hampstead), said that the meeting was confusing the words violence and force. Law was based on an effort to avoid the use of violence.

In reply to a question from Alan Jackson (Exeter), Stuart Morris explained that before a writ for libel was issued Earl Bathurst had been asked to justify his statement or to apologise. He had been offered access to all the PPU records, and correspondence had been continued over some weeks. It was felt that the suggestion that the PPU was used "to draw people into the Communist web" was one which could not go unchallenged.

Stuart Morris pointed out that this subject had more than retrospective value since National Council would have to decide whether to take similar action as a result of two other statements made in London.

Peter Oliver (Newcastle), said that as war resisters they were bound to resist war, but he saw no connection between that and law.

Gladys Gellett said that since the law of the land relied on force we should repudiate it. It was more important to keep our integrity than our good name.

The reference back was lost by a large majority.

Looking ahead

Nancy Edmonds asked whether under this heading she might make the suggestion that in regard to future AGMs National Council should encourage groups to put forward their ideas, and give opportunity for other groups to discuss these ideas, previous to the AGM.

The Chairman promised that consideration would be given to the suggestion, and asked that a resolution on the subject should be sent in to National Council from the Area.

The General Secretary's Report was then adopted.

Campaign Committee's Report

There was considerable discussion on the leaflets produced by the Campaign Committee, members criticising the leaflet entitled "Mrs. Higgs and Mrs. Nobbs" and also that entitled "How can they shake hands?" The clock leaflet had been widely appreciated.

Difference of opinion was expressed in regard to humour in leaflets. Phyllis Vallance emphasising the popularity of the light or the satirical leaflet, Dr. David (Cambridge) expressing uneasiness about them as effective pacifist propaganda.

Frank Dawtry (Surrey) asked whether there was any method of estimating the effect of leaflets. He wondered whether such expenditure was the best use of Campaign Committee resources.

Leonard Bird (Hull), congratulated

Get these posters displayed in your town!

NOTICE

TO YOUNG MEN OF 17-18 LIABLE TO REGISTER SHORTLY FOR MILITARY SERVICE

Under the National Service Act you are given the right to register as a Conscientious Objector and to claim exemption, if it would be against your conscience either to do combatant duties or to enter the Forces at all.

If you wish to have detailed information on procedure at registration and subsequently, you are invited to write for free literature regarding this, without putting yourself under any obligation to:

NORTHERN FRIENDS' PEACE BOARD FRIENDS' PEACE COMMITTEE
FRIENDS' MEETING HOUSE, OR FRIENDS' HOUSE,
CLIFFORD STREET, EUSTON ROAD,
LONDON, N.W.1.

The importance of letting boys know that they have the right of conscientious objection to military service was emphasised in an address to the AGM by John Kay, Chairman of the Friends' Peace Committee which issues the above poster jointly with the Northern Friends' Peace Board. Copies may be obtained 4d. post free from Friends' House, Euston-road, London, N.W.1.

Stuart Morris and Sybil Morrison on the part they had played in regard to University debates. The widespread publicity in the National press was of great value to the movement.

A car would help

Connie Jones (Birmingham), said that her activities as field worker were at an experimental stage. She realised the great value that lay in visiting individual members in areas where there was as yet no group, but these were often isolated and transport was a difficulty. She had found that where the loan of a car had been available she had been able to accomplish ten times the work in the same amount of time.

Sybil Morrison said that the reports that had already come in as a result of her work were most encouraging, and thanks were due both to her and to Joe Rowley (Development Officer), who arranged her tours for her.

In reply to a question from Bernard Withers (Secretary, CBCO), said that the percentage of National Service men and Reservists coming up at Tribunals would appear to be roughly about the same.

Peace News Report

Allen Skinner, Editor of Peace News, spoke with great appreciation of the development of the paper in recent years by Bernard Boothroyd and Hugh Brock. "I hope I shall not stop there," he said, "but in any case I shall owe a great deal to their foundations."

He spoke also most warmly of the team with which he now worked. "Never," he said, "in all my life in political, quasi-political, and Trade Union work, with the exception of the last few years with the No More War Movement, have I found such ungrudging and friendly help given—both at Blackstock-road and at Dick Sheppard House."

Speaking of the circulation, he said that there was an obstinate stop at about 12,000. We had got over the hurdle of the increase in price, but sales remained stationary.

During the next two or three weeks they were asking Trade Unionists to send in their names and addresses to Peace News and if the response was sufficient there were a number of things that they hoped to do in that direction. He asked individual members to consider whether in their own walk of life there was not something that could be done to further the sale of Peace News.

Rev. Patrick Figgis (London), said that it was difficult for people to consider pacifism unless they were helped to have some sort of religious basis for the faith they held.

He found it difficult to recommend Peace News to non-pacifist, non-Christian friends since although it advocated a pacifist policy it did little or nothing to convey that faith which would cause them to believe that unilateral disarmament, whatever the immediate consequences, was nevertheless the right step.

Many in the movement were asking fundamental questions, and they were receiving no answer.

(Continued on page seven)

JOHN
Fri
Approach

The lo
address—
years a t
at Booth
humour
combined
tive and
disagree
street.

The fir
fore we
country,
one to
fearless
a new w
He was
must aim
meetings a
ing an eli
their infl
make or de
of people's

The on
fluence we
contact, o
school, bus
tinuous p
that all th

We must
in speakin
bold and c
there is no
problem of
Century is
be a perio
but of aust
must prep

One of
which w
adventur

Dealing
groups, Jo
is the who
is the mos
a climate
other folk
thing app
schools. S
and co-ope
mentioning

Make Em

It would
significan
which was
World Day
idea of int
between a

Children
ally the ide
parts of th
skins, and

Most
visits fro
volution
coloured
member
and secu
country.

"Thinkin
girls are g
got to ren
clarified the
by weapon
great wea

We cannot
going to re
if we say
bomber wi
wrong.

Tanks int

"What w
to positive
can talk ab
can do, s
Northern 1
'The Great

We must
ing" the yo
up in front
them, the i
is set up, ar
into action.
is just an
learn."

"But the
right at
about peace

"One c
critical f
about eve

He sugge
be given to
them to sa
other side w
ticular inci



HAVE YOU SEEN THE NEW Reconciliation

the monthly review of the things of peace

Current Affairs

Forging the Revolution

by John Ferguson

Present Political Ingredients

by Reginald Sorensen

Repentance for Peace

by John Swomley

Ten Questions

by Paul Gliddon

International News

etc., etc.

Send for MAY issue now</

Bill's ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Bill

ters
town!

F 17-18
HORTLY
RVICE

Act
jister
and
would
either
or to
ailed
reg-
you
free
hout
any

CE COMMITTEE
HOUSE
1940
N.W.1

ing boys
right of
ilitary ser-
address to
man of the
rich issues
with the
rd. Copies
free from
l, London,

son on the
d to Univer-
publicity in
eat value to

, said that
were at an
ed the great
vidual mem-
as yet no
isolated and
e had found
r had been
o accomplish
e amount of

reports that
sult of her
and thanks
Joe Rowley
rranged her
ard Withers
the percent-
and Reser-
would ap-
same.

Peace News
of the de-
ent years by
Brock. "I
e said, "but
deal to their

of the team
'Never,' he
l, quasi-pol-
with the ex-
with the No
ind such un-
en—both at
c Sheppard

he said that
about 12,000.
the increase
tionary.

weeks they
to send in
Peace News
t there were
ped to do in
idual mem-
ir own walk-
that could
Peace News
(), said that
nsider pacif-
have some
faith they

mend Peac-
tian friends
pacifist policy
y that faith
ve that uni-
the imme-
rtheless the

ere asking
ey were re-
en)

"The Approach to Youth"

JOHN KAY, Chairman of the Peace Committee of the Society of Friends, opened the discussion on Sunday morning on "The Approach to Young People."

The long experience behind his address—he has been for twenty years a teacher of modern languages at Bootham School, York—and the humour with which it was put over, combined to make it both authoritative and enjoyable, although, as the discussion showed, a few members disagreed with some of his ideas.

The first thing we had to decide, said John Kay, was how much of "youth" we had to appeal to before we got the world we wanted. We all knew the difference in reaction between a picked group at a conference and the ordinary people we met in the street.

"How much do we need to touch before we can transform the people of this country, so that our country shall be the one to disarm, and to face the world fearlessly, showing that it has come to a new way of life?" he asked.

He was beginning to think that what we must aim at was not mass movements, huge meetings and great campaigns, but at training an élite which would gradually bring their influence to bear on the people who make or determine policy, and have control of people's thought.

Be bold and courageous

The only youth we ourselves could influence were those with whom we came in contact, on whatever level—the family, school, business or club level. It was a continuous problem of human relationships that all the time had to be solved.

We must be absolutely honest all the time in speaking to youth, and we must also be bold and courageous, in putting to them that there is no quick and easy solution, that this problem of war and peace in the Twentieth Century is a very long problem. It would be a period not necessarily of catastrophe, but of austerity and difficult living, and they must prepare themselves for this.

One of the chief qualities of youth to which we could appeal was the sense of adventure.

Dealing in succession with the various age groups, John Kay said: "In the home, it is the whole climate of the family life that is the most important thing. There must be a climate where the child learns to look on other folk in a certain way." The same thing applied to children in the primary schools. Such ideas as rights and duties, and co-operation could be instilled, without mentioning any of those words.

Make Empire Day "World Day"

It would be only a small step, but a very significant one, to change Empire Day, which was celebrated in many schools, into World Day. Empire Day already had the idea of international friendship, but it was between a limited number of countries only.

Children would accept absolutely naturally the idea that people came from different parts of the world, had different coloured skins, and so on.

Most schools already arranged for visits from coloured people; what a revolution is would be if we could have a coloured person teaching as a visiting member of the staff in many primary and secondary schools up and down the country.

"Thinking of whether young boys and girls are going to like war or peace, we have got to remember that they like war," declared the speaker. "They are fascinated by weapons—they just stand in front of a great weapon and look at it with awe.

We cannot assume that napalm bombs are going to repel young people, any more than if we say that the tank, the gun, or the bomber which they admire so much is wrong.

Tanks into tractors

"What we can do is to put this admiration to positive use—tanks into tractors. We can talk about positive work that aeroplanes can do, such as that described in the Northern Friends' Peace Board pamphlet 'The Great Diagonal'."

We must, however, beware of "instructing" the young. "As soon as a master gets up in front of a class and begins instructing them, the relationship of master and boys is set up, and their 'sales resistance' comes into action. To them, 'International Affairs' is just another subject they have got to learn."

"But there is a lot one can do to produce the right attitude of mind without talking about peace," John Kay went on.

"One of the first is to develop the critical faculty, make them sceptical about everything they see in print."

He suggested various exercises that could be given to school children, such as asking them to say what the newspapers of the other side would be saying about any particular incident, or to investigate the evi-

dence for germ warfare on the basis of the reports in the different newspapers.

Children should also be taught to realise the different interpretations which different countries put on things—from NATO and rearment to the Battle of Waterloo.

They should be told about schemes such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Jordan Valley scheme, and made to realise that funds could not be provided both for such work and for rearment.

All along the line we should be stressing the contribution that people in other lands had made in science, thinking, and the arts.

It was not until children reached the sixth form that international affairs should be discussed officially, and indeed it was more or less a rule that this subject should be taught to sixth forms.

Travellers should be the right sort!

As regards foreign travel, John Kay said: "I don't believe in travel, and mixing up, unless we are the right sort of people to start with. They talk about export drives, but lots of people are not fit to leave this country! Simply taking a class to Paris does not necessarily do any good."

Serving on school committees, in which boys and masters shared in the management of the school, taught the need for give and take. "Youth wants activity," said John Kay, "and the natural sequel to school lessons and activity is the work camps that have been set up in such large numbers in Europe. Through the work camp one gets practical experiences, and through the discussion which goes with it one sees its relevance to the world at large."

"The qualities of youth that we can appeal to," he concluded, "are their idealism, and their desire for leadership, their desire to be led along the lines that they have seen. To be right and all the time their dislike of insincerity."

Uncle Bill or Uncle John?

Here are summaries of some of the questions that were asked, and John Kay's answers:

Phyllis Vajlance (Chelsea): You have said we should not make outright propaganda to children, but suppose they ask you a direct question?

John Kay: If they ask a question like "Who is right, Uncle Bill, who went into the Army, or Uncle John, who didn't," tell them the truth as you see it.

It is astonishing what ideas children will develop without any prompting. For instance, my young nephew of nine, who had never heard of conscientious objectors, asked his mother, "do I have to go and fight, because if so I am not going to do so, and nobody is going to make me."

Trefor Davies (Palmers Green): What do you think of the idea that the PPU should set up a Youth Section?

John Kay: If we are doing our duty to the young people we know, they will at some time come into the pacifist movement, and if they want to, they will make a youth section of the PPU. If they don't want to do so, I think it will be artificial from start to finish.

Do Quaker schools turn out pacifists?

Peter Oliver (Newcastle): What percentage of boys leaving your Quaker schools are pacifists? What is the best means of popularising pacifism?

John Kay: I don't think it is possible to judge, but a good many boys who are not Quakers register as COs, and they do it because there is alternative service available for them—FAU International Service. It is very rare that a boy of 18 is ready to be an out and out pacifist.

We should cash in on the amount of public opinion there is already, and at the same time go on building up opinion so that more action can be taken.

We must show that the best things in life cannot be preserved by going to war. If we pretend that we are defending civilisation in Korea now, it is a pretence, because we are not doing so.

Suspicious of propaganda

Other points from speeches:

Anne Belshaw (Belfast): Young people are suspicious of propaganda, and terribly afraid of being thought cowards. Could we get hold of some people who have practical experience of war, such as the Friends' Ambulance Unit, or some young soldiers whose experience in the last war has made them become pacifists; stimulate the young people's imagination, and guide them into constructive thinking?"

Douglas Clark (Beckenham): I think the best service we can give to the young is to rigidly and uncompromisingly oppose conscription.

Alan Mister (Sharpthorne) urged that pacifists should work in the Boy Scout move-

"We need peace armies," says British pacifism's G.O.M.

LAURENCE HOUSMAN, 86-year-old author and sponsor of the Peace Pledge Union, sent the following letter to Sybil Morrison, PPU Chairman:

PLEASE tell the Peace Pledge Union how sorry I am that I cannot be with them at this year's Annual General Meeting.

I hope they will not regard it as a message of discouragement when I say that I believe the peace movement is facing more difficulties in the immediate future than ever before. But in those difficulties there is hope: for this country, as a whole, has become less sure than it was a few years ago that the Government's accepted policy of arming to preserve peace is going to result in a peace that will be worth having. And because it has lost confidence, and is less sure of itself, it is showing more fear and suspicion of those who believe that war is so fundamentally wrong (even for the defence of liberty) that it has no use whatever for those despondent doubters. Liberty has become the war-cry.

Now I believe that it is true that the vast majority of people in this country, though they hate war, still believe in war for the preservation of liberty. But I maintain on the contrary that a country that still believes in what it hates is a sick country—because it lacks the courage to practice that which it must love if it is to be peace-loving—namely goodwill towards those who to us are still so conspicuously lacking in that quality. And lack of goodwill is the breeding-ground for war.

What we need are not war-armies but Peace-armies, offered freely to all nations alike for the repairing of the ravages of war, and the raising of the life-standard of half-starved millions.

That "strange valour of goodwill to all nations" which John Ruskin called on us 90 years ago, to make the basis of our strength and safety, is still the call which we most need today. That, and that alone, I believe, will save us from another war.

"A thousand thanks for your persistence."

—SIR HUGH ROBERTON

Sir HUGH ROBERTON, Founder of the Glasgow Orpheus Choir and PPU sponsor, sent the following message:

Writing from a bed of suffering and trial and conscious of the fact that the struggle "yet endureth," the thought comes to me that it seems strange that the

struggle seems to be eternally one waged for sanity, not so much for new ideas as for the application of old untried ideas... Good luck to you all and a thousand thanks for your persistence.

"The better way" — Dame SYBIL THORNDIKE

Dame SYBIL THORNDIKE, Joint Hon. Treasurer of the PPU, wrote:

I wish I was able to be present at the AGM, but professional work prevents. You know I am in agreement with you on all general principles.

I always feel like rubbing in the obvious thought that militarists and governments assume all other countries to be potential

enemies—while the Christian assumes all to be potential friends; this carried out in our private lives can do a lot towards real peace. As a pacifist, I will not admit that any persons or peoples are my enemies. The positive Christian way is better than a military negative way.

All good wishes.

"A stand for peace sorely needed today"

—LESLIE SMITH

A tribute to Stuart Morris, General Secretary of the PPU, was paid in the following message to the AGM from LESLIE SMITH, Director of the National Peace Council:

The constructive approach invariably made by the PPU is increasingly appreciated and valued by your associates within the National Peace Council. We all watch with interest, with hope, and with thankfulness the stand for true world peace taken traditionally by the PPU—a stand more sorely needed today than ever before.

The PPU's representatives play a faithful and energetic part in the affairs of the Council, and show themselves as no narrow "partisans" but as citizens dedicated to

world peace.

In offering, therefore, at this appropriate occasion the Council's thanks for all that the PPU means, I would wish to record a special word about your General Secretary, Stuart Morris. He is involved in almost every part of the NPC's activities, and those who, like myself, work closely with him will know what I mean when I say that the ability, the courage, and the vision which he untiringly devotes to peace work are due unique recognition.

pared to study things, in order to develop a logical attitude if there is one."

Tony Bristow also said he thought if you could get hold of people before they reached adolescence it was more effective and permanent than if they accepted an idea during adolescence.

(The AGM Report is continued on page seven)

CHURCH OF ENGLAND PACIFISTS

should be on the roll of their own pacifist society. Send a card for particulars to the

Anglican Pacifist Fellowship
Newington Rectory, 59 Kennington Park Road, London, S.E.11.

TRUTH ABOUT GARLIC

Truth is many sided, as readers of this journal know; but notwithstanding sensational new drug discoveries, the truth about Garlic remains unchallenged as it has stood for 5,000 years. Send stamps 10d. for two booklets of life-conserving information about Garlic—that priceless purifier and healer given by nature for the use of Man.

Write to-day for these remarkable free booklets.

GARLISOL (non-smell) GARLIC REMEDIES
FAIRLIGHT, SUSSEX

Up and Doing

INTERESTED

—BUT NO TIME

EVERYONE who tries to get new readers for Peace News has met the very busy people, pacifists and sympathisers, who declare they just "haven't time to read it."

Patricia MacNaught, of Westminster, has one good answer, and it is just the right suggestion for those who really want to help—"if only time allowed":

First, a few names of overseas pacifists who are cut off by currency restrictions, or those of old age pensioners and others who cannot afford the paper, are obtained from this office. Next, Mr. Too-Busy-To-Read-It is asked if he would care to finance a copy for one of these people; is given the name of the recipient, and the local seller does the rest. If preferred subscriptions collected in this way may be sent to the PN office for despatching, we would then remind the donor when a further payment is due.

There are free copies to local libraries to be paid for, propaganda supplies to sympathetic organisations, voucher copies to newspaper editors; so many useful ways in which our busy friends, whether they read PN regularly or not, can help forward the work of putting pacifism on the map.

H.F.M.
Circulation last week: 12,500

PPU ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

(Continued from page five)

He suggested something like a fortnightly article by a leader of religious thought.

He realised that this would not appeal to all members of the movement, but there had to be a different approach to different men, and at present many in the movement were left high and dry. He hoped that something of this sort would be given consideration.

Dr. David (Cambridge), expressed appreciation of Peace News but felt that in view of the amount of research work entailed the strip cartoon might well be omitted—a view opposed by Frank Vibert who felt there should be something in Peace News that could be explained with interest to a small boy.

PPU Accounts

Douglas Clark presented the accounts, which for the first time showed a surplus of £330 income over expenditure.

An estimate of the Establishment, Administration and Campaign and Development expenditure for 1952-3—£4,900 was adopted. Stuart Morris reminding the AGM that while they could forecast their expenditure, unlike the Government they could not extract the money from people to meet it.

The closing session

A report of the closing session of the AGM, including R. H. Ward's address, will appear in Peace News next week.

A larger hall next year!

A NEW feature at this year's Annual General Meeting was the social gathering held at the close of the Saturday session.

Some 150 delegates and visitors crowded into the Alliance Hall where, after refreshments had been served, they were treated to a first-class exhibition of conjuring by Frank Vibert, Devon and Cornwall representative on PPU National Council, who is a member of the Magicians' Circle.

Those present unanimously voted the occasion a great success and asked the officers of the PPU to arrange a similar gathering as part of next year's AGM—but in a larger hall and with more tickets available.

W. E. BURSTOW

MANY Surrey pacifists will grieve to hear of the recent death of Mr. W. E. Burstow, of Reigate. During the war, and until failing health compelled him a few months ago to give up, he was Peace News distributor for the Reigate and Redhill area, and did much to keep pacifist witness alive during a difficult period.

Peace News expresses sincere sympathy to his family, and records its gratitude to a devoted worker.

H. F. M.

Notes for your Diary

As this is a free service, we reserve the right to select for publication notices sent in. We nevertheless desire to make it as complete a service as we reasonably can, and therefore urge organisers of events to:

1. Send notices to arrive not later than Monday morning.

2. Include: Date, TOWN, Time,

Place (hall, street); nature of event; speakers, organisers (and secretary's address)—preferably in that order and style.

Friday, May 2

BIRMINGHAM: 7.30 p.m. Midland Inst., Paradise St.; Henry Usborne, MP; Prof. Madge and others; Chair: Paul Cadbury; The Moscow Economic Conf.; Birmingham Peace Council and Crusade for World Government.

LONDON, E.7: 8 p.m. Upton Park Meth. Ch., Green St. (entrance Cromwell Rd.); J. Allen Skinner, Editor of Peace News; PPU.

LONDON, W.C.2: 1.30 p.m. St. Martin-in-the-Fields; Intercession Service for Peace: The Rev. Reginald Sorenson; APF, P.P.U.

LINCOLN: 7.30 p.m. Friends Mtg Ho., Beaumont Fee; Edith Adlam, "Korea"; Chair: Rev. John Jay; For.

Saturday, May 3 - Sunday, May 4

SHEFFIELD: Unstone Grange; Weekend Conf.: John Hoyland, "Pacifism in Action"; the Past, the Present, the Future"; Approximate cost 7s. 6d.; including booking fee 5s. Parties from Windling Eason, 68 Summerfield, Sheffield, 10.

ST. LEONARDS: Normanhurst Hotel; Weekend Conf.: Hugh Faulkner; Details from Clarence Tritton, Shepherd Corner, Hastings, Sussex; For.

Saturday, May 3

DERBY: Area Conf.: Clifford MacQuire; Details from Gerald Styles, 63 Field Lane, Derby; For.

LONDON, N.16: 2.30 p.m. 79 Lordship Park, Selsdon, Newington; Afternoon and evening conference; "Future plans"; Operation Gandhi.

LEICESTER: BUZZARD: 3.30 p.m. Friends Mtg Ho., North St.; Konrad Brahm, Dr. A. D. Belden, "Can Christians prevent a Third World War?" Chair: The Duke of Bedford and W. S. Beds and Herts Area Conf.

Sunday, May 4

LONDON, W.C.1: 10.30 a.m. - 5.30 p.m. International Centre, 32 Tavistock Square; AGM; Labour Pacifist Fellowship.

GLASGOW: 7.30 p.m. Miller St. at Argyle St.; Open-air Mtg; PPU.

Monday, May 5

HAMPSTEAD: 8 p.m. 12 Downside Cres. (Belsize Stn.); Horace Holder, "China"; For.

AT THE Z-TRIBUNAL

I want to free my wife and children from threat of war

(Continued from page one)

Asked about his job, he said he was a painter and decorator, and had been employed on war damage work since he came out of the Army in 1946.

The Tribunal decided that he "had considerable experience on which to found his views," and recommended him for registration.

"Ultimate expression of cowardice"

Joseph Solomons, a glass beveler, of Heydon Street, London, E.17, said that he had been in the Royal Artillery from 1940 to 1946, and served in France, Belgium, Germany and Palestine, reaching the rank of sergeant.

In a statement which he read to the Tribunal, he said that he hated all kinds of war with all his heart and soul, and believed that modern war was the ultimate expression of cowardice, and the denial of God.

"In the 20th century we are not even allowed to confront our slayers with a sword—the slayer needs only to push a button and the most horrible death is on the wing. How can any sane people just sit down and allow such a situation to develop? I want my wife and children to grow old free from the threat of war."

He also was recommended for registration.

Michael John Lennard, of Minard Road, Catford, formerly of the RCS, told the Tribunal that he was an agnostic. His conscientious objection developed when he had a nervous breakdown after coming out of the Army, and he gradually came to believe in the value of life as life, and that the point of his living was to use what creative powers he had to make the world better through his work as an architect.

At present, he said, he was designing school buildings. Judge Hargreaves asked him what a community was to do if it found itself surrounded by foes, who proposed to wipe it out unless it defended itself.

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it, he would be killed."

He replied, "Possibly if there were such a case I might feel I would fight," replied the applicant, and then added—"No, I don't think I would. I feel so strongly the futility of using my powers in this process of destruction."

The Tribunal said they could not recommend him for registration as a CO, because he had not thought out the matter sufficiently. "He takes the view that the immediate result of a community defending themselves might be good, but they should not do it, because taking a long

time to do it

ARMS PLANS DON'T BRING PEACE

Facts the Daily Herald ignores

(Continued from page one)

But a more constructive and conciliatory foreign policy on our side would have had exactly the same effect, and rearmament with all it implies would not have been needed at all.

Russia, certainly does fear another World War, and there is no evidence at all to show that she wishes to risk one. Otherwise she could have used her armies before we started rearmament, when, so Woodrow Wyatt and his school tells us, we were hopelessly inferior from a military point of view.

"Time," says Woodrow Wyatt, "will show how fast we must rearm next year."

Last year, however, (Aug. 19) Woodrow Wyatt told us:

"When 1954 comes, it will not matter so much if they do have a number of atom bombs, because we should be strong enough on the ground, not only to stop them starting a war, but to ensure that we can make a beginning on a general settlement of the problems of Europe and the world."

But this is only 1952, and are we to go on rearming until 1954 if the Russians are preparing for a general settlement of the problems of Europe now?

Woodrow Wyatt now says, "The Labour Government's £4,700 million programme must be completed, but it would be foolish to be dogmatic about the speed."

Yet surely that was exactly what the advocates of rearmament were dogmatic about. Nobody argued then, "we must spend £4,700,000,000 on rearmament, but we don't mind how long it takes—whether we spend it over three years or six."

Then, we were told that speed was the essential thing, as surely it must be if rearmament is to be regarded as a military operation.

The fact is that the economic consequences of rearmament are daily becoming so obvious to the people who have supported the Labour Party hitherto because they believed that Labour had a policy

"Troubled Uganda," one of the pamphlets mentioned in the Undeveloped Areas issue of Peace News (March 21) is out of print, reports the Fabian Colonial Bureau. Publications still available with a bearing on the subject are "The Way Forward," by James Griffiths, Creech Jones and Rita Hinden (1s. 3d.); "British Colonial Africa" (1s.); "Trusteeship in Practice," by Molly Mortimer (2s.).

Pacifist Trade Unionists

Peace Pledge Union members who are members of trade unions are asked to communicate with Peace News, 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4, giving their name, address, and name of union.

IRENOUNCE WAR AND I WILL NEVER SUPPORT OR SANCTION ANOTHER

This pledge, signed by each member, is the basis of the Peace Pledge Union. Send YOUR pledge to

P.P.U. HEADQUARTERS
Dick Sheppard House, Endsleigh St., WCI

SHEFFIELD CUTLERY IS THE BEST

Stainless Table and Desert Knives, white Xylo handles in boxes 29s. dozen
Stainless spoons and forks to match 15s. dozen
Stainless tea spoons 10s. dozen
Stainless scissors — household 8 inch 5s. a pair
dressmakers 8½ inch 7s. a pair
nail 2s. 6d. a pair
Also 9 inch Pinking Scissors 39s. a pair
Send today. Cash with order. 6d. postage.

The Manager of Peace News writes: "Thank you for the scissors, they are very satisfactory and excellent value."

T. CAPPER, Cutler
18 Ashberry Road, Sheffield 6

THE HOPE FOR HUMANITY

Ursula Jeans Dr. Vaughan Williams

YEHUDI MENUHIN

LORD BEVERIDGE

John Tilney, M.P. R. W. G. Mackay

Chair: Rev. Canon Collins

KINGSWAY HALL,
FRIDAY 9th MAY, 7. p.m.

ADMISSION FREE

Reserved seats 2/6 Reserved area 1/-

Tickets from: FEDERAL UNION
20 Buckingham Street, W.C.2

which meant raising the standard of life, that Labour must change its attitude towards rearmament or be behind public opinion instead of leading it.

That is the reason why the Daily Herald is publishing headlines like "Our Arms Plan is Stride to Peace."

But Arms Plans don't bring Peace. Only an enlightened and constructive foreign policy can do that. All that Arms Plans bring are Arms Plans from the other side.

If Arms Plans are the only way to peace we still have to reconcile ourselves to always carrying a large expenditure on armaments which will cripple the Welfare State and prevent the advance to a higher standard of life and a civilisation worthy of the name.

Rifles versus radio-activity

I'm asking you to enrol (for the Home Guard). But you aren't the only person concerned. There's your wife. She may say: "You've got past that sort of thing. Your figure is no longer made for battledress, and won't you look silly marching about with a gun?" But don't believe her . . . First, no man looks silly with a weapon he knows how to use in his hand. And second, no woman was ever born who didn't in her heart of hearts admire a man who's ready to defend her . . . And don't say "What's the use of a Home Guard in this atomic age?" Believe me, if the horrors of atomic bombing fall on this island one of our first needs will be a force of steady, disciplined, armed men throughout the country . . . if any aggressor is mad enough to start such bombing, for every atomic bomb dropped on us he'll get 20 back.

—Field-Marshal Sir William Slim, April 26, 1952.

IT is curious that in recruiting for the Home Guard, Field-Marshal Slim has had to abandon the age-old contention that women like to see their men in uniform, and seeks to prove that whatever the women may say in their attempt to prevent their men from joining, they must not be believed, because in their hearts they deeply admire the man in uniform who will fight and die, if necessary, in their defence.

These generalisations about women are always recurring in one form or another, and few people perceive the rather strange reflection that is made upon the mentality of the male sex if they were true!

Actually generalisations are seldom true. Some women possibly think uniform is more becoming to a man than civilian garb of one kind or another, but there are also many men who "fancy" themselves in uniform. Mosley's fascists were probably largely recruited through the fact that the black shirt, high up to the chin, was uncommonly becoming, and in many cases covered a multitude of spots and double chins.

There were some women, who to their shame, handed around white feathers in the first world war to men who were not in uniform, but it now appears that it is the wives who will be deserving of the white feather, since in order to prevent their husbands from once again donning uniforms, it is feared they will appeal to the base vanity of the male by making out that he looks "silly." The Field-Marshal, therefore, in all the glory of his own uniform and plumes, must hasten to reassure him and explain that it is not women's words, but what is in their hearts that matters.

It remains significant, however, that men should need to be warned against their own wives showing them up as fools. Yet, it might be the saving of the human race if women and men realised, not so much how silly a man may look "marching about with a gun," but how silly he is.

*

It is quite untrue that a man could never look silly with a weapon in his hand that he knew how to use; he may look very silly indeed with a rifle against an atom bomb, however well he may have learned to use it.

What use, in fact, are the guns going to be against radio-activity, against collapsed buildings and raging fires? It is possible they could be used for the purpose of putting animals, and even human beings, out of intolerable pain, or possibly to deal with panic, which may well be the true explanation of the phrase in the Civil Defence White Paper—"to maintain order and sustain morale."

Sir William Slim destroys his own argument and makes the utter futility of the whole Home Guard scheme perfectly clear when he explains that the only real answer in atomic warfare is, to use Mr. Churchill's phrase, "give it 'em back."

That was the consolation that the supreme head of the defence of this country brought to the people in the last war, as the bombs destroyed their homes, buried them alive, wounded, blinded and burned them. He did not offer them safety, or protection even for their helpless and innocent children—he offered them revenge, and revenge only. We have seen since, with bitter clarity, what happens when reciprocal brutality becomes an accepted weapon of war; the atom bomb was the ultimate extension of that whole idea.

Now we have gone on to bigger, and better, and more atomic weapons, and it is obvious that 20 dropped on Russia to every one dropped here cannot save the people of this island. If women have had the common sense to see that guns and battledress will be as much use as the proposed pikes and rolling pins suggested in 1940, it is at least an encouraging sign.

For if, as it seems, the scheme deserves nothing better than to be "laughed out of court" then the women the Field-Marshal fears may well have paved the way to a new approach; the way, not of armed civilians and ferocious threats, but of negotiation from good will, and total renunciation of the war method.

higher than in war-time. The "short-term rate" is 100 per cent, and the long-term rate 50 per cent. above the 1944 level. That means Budget subsidies to bankers and money lenders (e.g., Treasury Bills). Dr. Dalton's "cheap money policy" would reduce the crushing interest burden on national debt.

5.—The present economic system in the Colonies is an anachronism. The fact is that Colonies "invest" in Britain, as stated frankly by the Daily Express (Opinion, April 9):

"The Colonies, by their exports, have earned £964m. (mainly) in dollars. Britain, in return, has credited the Colonies with an equivalent in sterling without supplying them with goods!"

"Let there be no more patronising talk in this country about 'Colonial development.' And no more doubt about who is taking the money and who is giving it."

If Labour declares that "Our first duty is Peace" the programme for a return to peace economy should be prepared now.

F.R.

(9) An immediate reduction of British arms imports in order to release manpower, money and resources for the reconstruction of the Commonwealth countries and the rehabilitation of the colonies under the United Nations.

(10) Britain should by renouncing atomic and similar methods in the world (now awaiting under international control).

FACTS AND FIGURES

Economic Survey of 1952 shows arms drive havoc

"In metal-using industries the main expansion during 1951 was in output of military equipment and in some important sections production declined (e.g., cars, commercial vehicles).

"The proposed cuts in investment in plant, machinery and vehicles will result in a net reduction of £150m. a year in total home deliveries for civil use as compared with 1951."

The above fact contributes to a defeat of the main objective of the Survey (p. 47):

"Higher productivity is necessary at a time when production and employment are threatened by foreign competition."

EXPORT DIFFICULTIES

The decline in currency reserves—caused by a fall in exports to the dollar area and panicky imports in 1951—resulted in import cuts by Britain (£500m.). Other Commonwealth countries (Australia, South Africa, India) did the same, reducing also purchases from Britain.

The tariff policy of the US hampers Britain's export possibilities (see "British protest," Financial Times, April 19) and makes the dollar deficit worse. A further decline in dollar reserves would lead to the disintegration of the "Sterling Area."

An improvement of the position is possible through an expansion of trade with Eastern Europe.

FAIR COMPETITION

A peculiar method of improving exports was suggested by Sir Vincent Tewson (Daily Herald, April 26):

"Sir Vincent Tewson, Secretary of the TUC, told the Conference of the Labour Federation in New Zealand that if Japan and Germany were not forced to return to defend Western civilisation, they would have an unfair advantage in world markets."

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech? Has Sir Vincent not been told that Australia's Labour Party opposes America's Japanese Treaty; Britain's Co-operative Party unanimously rejected Germany's rearmament; and Dr. Dalton has just lead a Labour delegation to Germany to counteract the resuscitation of German militarism?

Everyone has the right to express his opinion and make a fool of himself by demanding "forced defence of civilisation" linked up with "fair competition." But who gave the job to the Secretary of the TUC to make this speech?